

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1-42 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 10, 15, 16, 18, 22-24, 28, 31, 35-38, and 40-42 have been amended herein. No claims have been added and claims 2, 6, 19, 25, and 32 have been canceled. Therefore claims 1, 3-5, 7-18, 20-24, 26-31, and 33-42 remain pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application for at least the reasons presented below.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Schneider**

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,408,336 of Schneider et al. (hereinafter Schneider). The Applicants respectfully submit the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 1-48 submitted by the Applicants and Schneider.

Schneider is directed to "control of access to data in a distributed environment" (col. 1, lines 32-33) and more specifically to making access filters more scalable by decentralizing administration of these filters (col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 1). Under Schneider, "a member of an administrative user set which administers an object may make administrative policy for the object; this permits an administrative user set to delegate its right to administer the object to another administrative user group." (Col. 6, lines 14-17) "When the access filter is set up, a built-in administrative policy gives a built-in administrative user group called the security officer the right to make administrative policy for all objects in the system." (Col. 6, lines 22-25) "Generally, the policy maker policy is set up to give only a small number of high-level security experts the right to make access policy." (Col. 6, lines 28-30) "The remaining administrative policy is delegated to user groups who have the requisite knowledge of the entities being administered." (Col. 6, lines 30-33)

That is, Schneider teaches delegating some administrative tasks to sub-administrators for the various groups. These sub-administrators, such as a department secretary (col. 6, lines 44-47), then perform these delegated tasks, such as adding or removing members to or from the group (col. 6, lines 57-59). However, Schneider does not disclose allowing users to self-subscribe to or self-unsubscribe from user groups as recited in the pending claims.

Claim 1, upon which claims 3-5 and 7-17 depend, claim 24, upon which claims 26-30 depend, and claim 37, upon which claims 38-39 depend, each recite in part "receiving from a first entity a request to add the first entity to a first group; accessing an indication of a first policy from a set of policies for changing static membership of said first group; and adding said first entity to said first group as a static member based on said first policy." Schneider does not disclose receiving a request from an entity to add that entity to a group and adding that entity to the group based on a policy, i.e., allowing users to self-subscribe. Rather Schneider teaches delegating some administrative tasks to sub-administrators for the various groups, such as a department secretary, who can then perform these delegated tasks, such as adding members to the group. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 3-5, 7-17, 24, 26-30, and 37-39 should be allowed.

Claim 18, upon which claims 20-23 depend, claim 31, upon which claims 33-36 depend, and claim 40, upon which claims 41-42 depend, each recite in part "receiving from a first static member a request to remove the first static member from a first group; accessing an indication of a first policy from a set of policies for changing static membership of said first group; and removing said first static member from said first group based on said first policy." Schneider does not disclose receiving a request from a first static member to remove that member from a group and removing that member from the group based on a policy, i.e., allowing users to self-unsubscribe. Rather Schneider teaches delegating some administrative tasks to sub-administrators for the various groups, such as a department secretary, who can then perform these delegated tasks, such as removing members from the group. For at least these reasons, claims 18, 20-23, 31, 33-36, and 40-42 should be allowed.

Appl. No. 09/998,898  
Amdt. dated: December 19, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2005


PATENT

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Daley  
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 303-571-4321

WJD:sbm  
60634868 v1